785 L

The Use of the Lords Prayer;

Vindicated and Asserted against the Objections of *Innovators*, and *Enthusiasts*.

Translated from the *French* Original, written by Monsieur *D' Espagne*, a Learned Presbyterian.

K. *Charles* the 1. Εικων Βασιλικη, Chap. 16. *Some men are so impatient, not to have all their Devotions their own Invention and Gifts, that they not only dislike, but wholly cast away and contemn the Lord's Prayer; whose great guilt is, that it is the Warrant and Original Pattern of all set Liturgies in the Christian Church.*

EDINBURGH,

Printed in the Year, 1689.

THE TRANSLATOR To the READER.

ALbeit this and the last Age have seen more Controversie in Britain, *about the lawfulness of set Forms of Prayer, than all former Ages have done, all the world over; yet it could hardly been thought that the* Lords Prayer *would have run the same fate with Humane Composures. To obviat all possible Objections against the use of this Prayer, is the design of this little Treatise; which was Originally writ in* French *by a Learned* Protestant *Minister, who has likewise published a Discourse of Popular Errors, with great Ingenuity. It's true, that the learned Doctor* Hammond, *Doctor* Falkner, Joseph Mede *and others have sufficiently vindicated the using of set Forms; but none has with such brevity, perspicuity and nervousness asserted our Blessed Saviours Form, as our Author has done. It was well said by an eminent Member of the* West-minster *Assembly,* God forbid that ever I should kneel down to my Devotions, and rise without saying the Lords Prayer; *And when some Leading* Remonstrators *in the West of* Scotland *begun tacitly to disuse it, the General Assembly wrote a Letter, charging them with Innovation, and intreating them to return to a better mind: So that this Noval Practice is not true*

mark

Ym 4/80 97 76

mark of a [illegible]byterian, but rather an evidence to the contrary.

As for this Translation, it was undertaken at the desire of one, whose command I judged it a Crime to disobey; and if it shall be any ways serviceable to undeceive well-meaning, but misled persons, or to confirm others in their pious usage, I shall think my Labour well bestowed; but however, I am assured the few Hours employed on this Task, were not wholly thrown away.

The Use of the Lord's Prayer,

Vindicated against the Objections of Modern Innovators.

WE read in the Gospel, of the Lunatick Person, that the unclean Spirit wherewith he was possest, did *sometimes cast him into the fire, and sometimes into the water*, these contrary elements. Me think: there is a great resemblance of this in matters of Religion; for it would seem that the same evil Spirit makes it his work to drive men from one extream of Superstition into another. The Church of *Rome* in all her acts of Devotion affects an endless Repetition of the *Pater Noster*, out of an opinion that the words themselves, or the frequent reiterating of them, carries some secret Magical Vertue in it. Many now a-days have run into the quite contrary Superstition, shunning the very words of this Prayer, as a Stone of stumbling, and Rock of Offence. Others who dare not be so bold as wholly to condemn the use of this Prayer, yet startle to repeat it in their daily Devotions, and chuse rather to pass it over in silence. So that this Prayer is in a manner banished out of Families, and publick Meetings where it used formerly to re-sound: This Light which was put upon a Candlestick, to give light to those that are in the House: is now buried under a Bushel. If it were discarded and laid aside only by Hereticks, or profane Wretches, we would tax them with Irreligion and contempt

of our H. Saviour. But since these People profess themselves to be otherwise Orthodox Christians, we are no whit astonished at this Novelty, though formerly we would have abhorred it as a prodigious Innovation.

Now to state the question aright; we are not so wedded to the Letter, as to condemn all other Forms of Prayer, or that we will not admit of any other expressions. But other Prayers may be said, and this not left unsaid. It's a bold adventure to attempt the total obliterating of the memory of such a Prayer. A Prayer used hitherto in all the Churches of God, Antient & Modern, throughout the Universal World. A Prayer endited by the Eternal Wisdom, our ever blessed Mediator and Redeemer, who offers up our Prayers unto God, and is perfectly acquainted with all the secrets of the Fathers Breast. The most full and comprehensive Form that can be devised, and which contains all the reasonable Requests which can be imagined. A Prayer, which is the Epitome, Mirror, and pattern of all other Prayers. A Prayer, which reconciles wonderful brevity, with great copiousness and variety of Matter; As if it made a Camel pass through the Eye of a Needle. A Prayer, which contains more Histories and Mysteries than it does Words. In short, a Prayer the most Methodical, Emphatick, and Divine, that can be composed. For all the parts of this Prayer are admirable for a beautiful Symmetry, regular Measures, and exact Proportion: All is full of Luminaries, which give mutual light to one another. One Article calleth upon one another (a deep calls to deep): Nay, these very persons who disuse it, must confess that all the Ingenious Men upon Earth, and all the Angels in Heaven

ven were never able to frame the like on't.

Did then our Bleſſed Saviour give us this Prayer that we ſhould never ſay it at all? On the contrary, he tells us, Pray thus, *Our Father which art in Heaven.* To this it is anſwered, Chriſt bids us *pray thus*, that is to ſay, to this purpoſe, but not in the ſame words preciſely. Well, be it ſo? But when he ſays (*Luke* 11. 2.) *when you pray, ſay, Our Father which art in Heaven*, does he forbid us to pray in theſe words? Becauſe he teaches us to ſay, *Our Father*, &c. muſt we infer that we ſhould not ſay it? And it is filly to alledge, that if it were a Command, we ſhould uſe that Prayer conſtantly, and never ſay another. This is all one as if you ſhould affirm, we are not commanded to pray to God, becauſe the Apoſtle ſays, *Pray always*, 1 *Theſ.* 5 17. As if the meaning of this were, that we ought to do no other work at all but pray to God. But ſuppoſing it be not a Command, and that Chriſt has not enjoyned us to ſay this Prayer always; neither has he forbidden us the frequent uſe thereof, far leſs diſcharged us ever to ſay it at all. It is a weak pretence, that it is ſufficient to expreſs our Saviours meaning and intention in this Prayer, though we repeat not his very words. For muſt we ſuppreſs his words in order to expreſs his meaning: Or can we better expreſs Chriſts ſenſe and meaning, than by uſing his own words.

What can they then plauſibly object againſt the ordinary uſe-making of the Lords Prayer? Doubtleſs it muſt be this.

Either it is not lawful,
Or it is not neceſſary,
Or it is not expedient.

Let us conſider theſe in order, Is it unlawful to

to say this Prayer? This cannot be: for then it were unlawful to read it, nay we behoved to raze out these two Passages of Scripture where it is set down, *Mat. 6. Luke 11.* It signifies nothing to say, many abuse it; This is the Argument which our Adversaries adduce to hinder the common people from reading the Bible. If the Devil himself, and his Infernal Agents in their Charmes employ Sentences out of the Psalms and Gospels, should we wholly abstain from using these Passages? If it be unlawful to utter them superstitiously, shall it be unlawful to use them devoutly? And if we are allowed in Prayer to use our own words, shal we be forbidden to employ our Saviours words, which are the Rule of ours.

It is therefore lawful; But, say they, it is not necessary. Suppose it be not necessary to say the Lords Prayer, Is it necessary to let it alone? If it be indifferent to say or not to say it, must we for a matter of Indifference bring in a division in the Church, effect Novelty, break established Order, and beget Scruples of Conscience? Besides, there are degrees of Indifference, as well as of Necessity. Would they say, that the using or omitting this Prayer, is in the same Rank of Indifferency, as the eating of, or abstaining from certain meats? Surely that which ministers to Edifying cannot be wholly Indifferent. Will they say, that our Saviours words tend not to Edification? Albeit they dare not positively owne this, yet in effect their Arguing amounts to no less; For they maintain, that it is not expedient to say the Lords Prayer: this is the very Hinge of the Dispute, and Pinch of the Controversie.

Why then is it not expedient to say this Prayer in the expres words of the Holy Jesus: What great

great Inconveniences do arise from thence? What prejudice to God's Glory? What hinderance to Man's Salvation? What Ruine to the Churches Edifice?

upon this Head they alledge.

That we should not be confin'd to words.

That there is hazard of Idolizing the words, by saying them so often.

That our taking heed to the Syllables, stints the Spirit, and diverts the thoughts.

That this frequent Repetition is the vain babling condemned by our Saviour.

That this Prayer does not sufficiently enumerat all our particular wants.

That it is differently worded by two Evangelists, to shew that we should not take notice to the words wherein it is compil'd.

That the Apostles themselves never made use of it.

That many cannot say it, but to their condemnation; because it obliges every Man to beg forgiveness of his sins, upon condition that he forgive his Enemies.

That it is not suitable to a dying man, because he has no longer need to say, *Give us our daily bread.*

That it was never intended for a Prayer, but only for a Rule and Pattern of Devotion.

And lastly,

That in their daily Prayers, they comprehend the Substance thereof, albeit in different Words.

The General Answer to these Objections.

To all this, I shal in the first place return a General Answer, which strikes at the Root of most of their Objections.

It is unquestionably evident, nor can these men deny

deny it; That under the old Dispensation, God prescribed set Forms of Prayer, and other religious Actions, to be repeated word by word. Such was the form wherewith the Priests blessed the People, as you may read in the 16 of *Numbers*. Such was the form of Thanksgiving, appointed at the Offering of the First-fruits, *Deut.* 26. Such was the Prayer and Protestation expressly enjoyned those that came to paythe Tithe of the third year, *Deut.* 26. Such also were the Forms of Prayer, which *Moses* usually said when the Ark went forward; and when it rested, *Numb.* 10. 35, 36. Of the same nature was the Form of Prayers and Thanksgivings, which were daily sung in the Church. For were not the *Psalms* most part *Prayers* or Thanksgivings? and were they not commonly said and sung?

I shall not insist upon this, that each Company of Singers, were expressly tyed to certain Psalms, as to a Task, which is clear from the Titles of these Psalms. The 92 *Psalm* was sung every *Sabbath*-day, as the Inscription plainly imports. Now consider, why would God appoint Prayers, couched in Verse, if it were not on purpose that they should be said *verbatim*? For it is well known, how difficult it is to change the words of a Line, that is fettered in Poetick Numbers. Moreover, We have several *Psalms* wherein God has appointed ev'n the observation of the Letters of the Alphabet. The 25 *Psalm*, which is a *Prayer*, as to the substance, coincident with the Lord's Prayer, begins almost every verse according to the order of the *Hebrew* Alphabet. The 34, 111, the 112, and the 119 are of the same contrivance, especially this last mentioned, in each of its *Stanza's*, answering eight times to the number and order of the twenty

two

two Letters. It is visible, God intended this expedient for a help to mens Memories, that so ev'n the most forgetful might easily retain the words of these holy Verses, whose Initial Letters proceeded in an Alphabetical order. Would He then had them neglect the words, when he ordained the punctual rehearsing of every single Letter? To this I might add, that some *Psalms* (as for instance the 118 and the 134.) are penned by way of Dialogue between the Priests and People. This alternative Discourse, consisting in reciprocal communication of the one with the other, could not be kept up without exact observation of the words of their mutual intercourse.

Besides, In the Reformation of the Church by that good King *Hezekiah*, when the publick Liturgy was to be re-establish'd, the Levites were commanded to praise the Lord with the words of *David* and *Asaph* the Seer; that is, to say or sing the very words of the Psalms, 2 Chr. 29. 30. It appears also, that at the Celebration of the Passover, there was a set Hymn always made use of upon that solemn occasion. And our blessed Lord himself, after he had eat the Passover, and was now preparing himself for death, did not stick to say it, and caused his Disciples bear a part with him in the recital thereof, *Mat.* 26. *vers.* 30.

If our modern Bigots, who condemn the use of the Lord's Prayer, had liv'd in these days, I doubt me they would have censured the wisdom of God for prescribing set Forms of Prayer, and obliging the Church to say them word for word.

For the same Arguments, they muster up against the use of this Prayer, the same inconve-

niences

niences they find in it, the same shifts and evasions whereby they decline the repeating it; All this might have been alledged against the Forms of Prayer, of Blessing and of Thanksgiving which God imposed upon his antient People. Could they not have said, that it was not fit to be confin'd to the words of these Formularies? and that it was sufficient to speak to the same purpose? that the Spirit should not be limited? that by being taken up with words, good thoughts are lost? that these were continual Repetitions? that these set Forms did not express all that was necessary to be desired? that there was hazard of making Idols of them? and in sum, that it was expedient to suppress the use of them? 'Tis a surprizing thing, that God Almighty did not foresee these inconveniences. 'Tis strange that these Persons have not as yet laid aside the singing of Psalms. For if their Maxime hold weight, it is as ill to sing them, as to say the Lord's Prayer. If we must not be tyed up to the words of this Prayer, why should we be tyed up to the words of the Psalms? If the Spirit should not be stinted, is it more stinted by the words of this Prayer than by these of a Psalm? If the expressions of this Prayer divert the thoughts of him that prayeth, cannot the singing of a Psalm jumble and discompose them too? If this prayer should not be said over and over again, if it do not specifie all occurrences, if there is hazard of Idolizing the words thereof, may not the same be said of any Psalm whatsoever? nay and much more. For we sing many Psalms which we are not so much concern'd in, or wherein we have not so great interest as in the Lord's Prayer. In them we meet with prayers expressly dedicate

for

for the *Jewish* Church, relating to by-past Occurrences, and which by no means reach unto us. There we have Petitions, Imprecations, Reasonings, Complaints, which were divine in *David*'s mouth, but in ours they are much more debatable than the Lord's Prayer is. Why then doth this Prayer go more against the Grain with us, than these Prayers contained in the Psalms? Add hereunto, that the Psalms, as they are sung in our vulgar Languages, are the production of humane Industry, and the work of a Poet's brain; so that such a Composure, tho never so excellent, is in no wise so divine as the Lord's *Prayer*: why then shal there be more inconvenience in saying the words of our Saviour, than in singing those of mens introducing. Furthermore, since in stead of the Lord's Prayer, we judge it more proper to have Forms of our own Composing, or extemporary effusions; why do we not, instead of the Psalms, dayly compose Hymns purely new to be sung in the Church? Is it for want of Poetick Raptures, that we are obliged to hold by a constant tenor of Psalms? Now if it be edifying to say and repeat them in their own proper terms, why not also the Lord's *Prayer*, which is the abstract of all the Prayers contained in the Psalter.

But having said thus much in answer to these Objections in gross, I come now to examine each of them in retail.

Object. 1. They alledge in the first place, that we should not confine our selves to Words.

Answ. This Maxime taken universally, and without distinction, is false, and of mischievous consequence; for if it should hold, we must resist the reading of the Bible, for in reading thereof, we must keep close to the Letter; we

must

must not translate it, for in the matter of a Version we must come as precisely near to the Original as is possible. A Paraphrase is never so much to be trusted to, and the alteration of one word sometimes alters the whole sense. In sacred History, we must of necessity retain the proper names of Places and Persons. In the Law we are bound to take care of the least jot, and the smallest point.

2. But the Objection is ambiguous; for if they mean, that we are not so tyed up to the words of this Prayer, as to be precluded from using all others; Thus far we are both agreed. But if they mean, under pretence of this liberty, that we must neglect or lay aside this Form of Prayer, we beg leave to dissent from them. For, because Christ allows us to use our own expressions, must we bury his? Because our words are current, must we cry down these of the Holy Ghost? Nay on the other side, if ours be good, how much better are these, which he himself has taught us? so far should we be from shunning the language of God, that on the contrary we should do our utmost endeavour to make our selves familiarly acquainted with it. And I wish to God, we were so well versed in it, that we could have it always in our mouth?

Object. 2. But here we are allarmed with a great danger; That by putting such a value on the words of this Prayer, it's to be feared we make an Idol of it.

Answ. 1. This is really a strange Paradox, that the words of this Prayer, which teach us to fly Idolatry, should be suspected by us as capable to betray us unto that sin. For this Prayer teacheth us to Invocate only, *Our Father which in Heav.*

heaven, to ascribe *Kingdom*, *Power*, and *Glory* to
im alone. May not these Folk as rationally con-
lude, that we are in hazard of Idolizing the
econd Commandment, if we repeat it too often?
Will we not make an Idol of that Command
hichforbids Idols? Sure I am the Church of
ome did not fall into Idolatry, by too frequent
hearsing the words of that Commandment,
t by neglecting of them, nay expunging them
t of her Catechisms and Manuals which they
t in the Laity's hands.

2. But may not one also turn an Idolater of
e words of the Institution in Baptism? must we
ot turn them out of doors likewise, to avoid Ido-
atry? And are not the words of Consecration
the Eucharist, *Hoc est corpus meum*, lyable to
e same peril? the grossest Idolatry in the
orld is bottom'd on the speaking these words
slunderstood. *Must* we then let them alone
together? or should we not use them as oft
we rehearse the Institution of the Lord's Supper?
ay I shall add further, the superstitious *Jews*
ade an Idol of the name *Jehovah*, telling that
e pronouncing thereof, was able to work the
reatest Miracles, In so much as to remove *Moun-*
tains; now should their Superstition hinder us
om pronouncing the proper Name of God, or
ust we every day coin a new Name for the Al-
ghty, lest his usual Name being too frequently
ttered, become an Idol at the last?

3. *Moreover*, there is the same hazard in any
her Prayer whatsoever, which is pretended
reference to the Lords Prayer. For cannot
man Idolize the words of a Form, though
wly contrived? Do not we know that men are
turally fond of Novelties? And must we then

wholly

wholly refrain the exercise of Prayer, to ke
us entirely out of the reach of Idolatry?

Object. 3. Now follows another Objectio
which aims at the making Christ contradict hi
self: For (say they) Christ has condemn
vain Repetitions in Prayer: But so it is, the U
of the Lord's Prayer is a perpetual Repetition.

Answ. 1. Consult the 6 *Ch.* of *S. Matthew*, t
7, and following Verses. There you will find
Saviour prescribed that Prayer, to hinder va
Repetitions. But *when you pray* (saith he) *
not vain Repetitions* but *pray after this manner, O
Father*, &c. And shall we call that a vain Repe
tion, which is given us as an Antidote against va
Repetitions? Would Christ cure one Disease
another of the same nature, or cast out one De
to bring in another?

2. Our Saviour doth not condemn all Rep
titions, without exception; For he himself, wh
he was in his Bloody Agony reiterated the sam
words thrice in one Evening, *Father, if it
possible, let this Cup pass from me*, Mat. 27. 39, 4
And in the self same Psalm, (to wit the 136.)
very Verse ends with this burden, *For his m
cy endureth for ever.* And these words are
and twenty times Geminated.

3. What Repetitions then are forbidden? Su
as are vain. Now they are vain, if we are of
opinion that the multiplying of them has any ve
tue and efficacy in it. They are vain also, if th
be void of understanding, Faith, or Affectio
But the Repetition of one Prayer, animated wi
that fiduciary and fervent application of the Sp
rit to God (wherein the Life and Soul of Pray
consists) can never be vain. As on the cont
ry, a Prayer destitute of that Spirit, will certa

be vain, although it be once repeated, and no more. Besides, if I may renew the same thoughts had formerly, Why may I not resume them in the same words, wherewith they were formerly cloathed? Perhaps there is as much vanity in the minutly reiterated sighs of some Modern Zealots, as in the reiterating our Saviours Expressions.

4. Again, I strange that these men pretend such an averseness to Repetitions, since the most part of their Devotions are built thereupon. A Repetition consists not only in saying over again the same words, but also in inculcating the same thing, tho under various terms. Is it not a Repetition, if one having named Dirt, should a little after call it Mire? Or having mentioned a Sword, he should immediatly talk of a Rapier? Are not the Synonimies and Circumlocutions, wherewith their Prayers are stuffed, so many Repetitions?

5. Furthermore, it is observable, that the passage objected to us (*Mat.* 6. 7.) doth not onely forbid vain Repetitions, but also multitude of words? Why are not these people apprehensive, that the Prolixity of their Prayers, which are often equal in length to a long-winded Preachment, is as vain, as the saying the Lord's Prayer once over? Or is the prolixity of their Devotions more contrary to vain babling, than the brevity of this? Peradventure, they'l put the Question, How many times a day, or in one hour, must we say it? But this is all one as if they should ask how often must we pray to God. For we are commanded to pray always; nor that God requireth of us an uninterrupted act of Devotion, but it ought nevertheless to be frequent. Moreover, the true value of our Prayers consists in

weight, and not in number, or in measure.

Object. 4. Proceed we to the next Exception which is thus couched. The words of him that prayeth should accompany or follow his thoughts: but during his attention to the Lord's Prayer his good thoughts will go astray, and his mind will be diverted.

Answ. 1. This is a huge mistake, and it's a odd thing to say, that the words of Christ are diverse of good thoughts. Did they but understand this Prayer a-right, they would not talk at this rate. Is it possible for us to have better thoughts in prayer, than these which are wrapt in the words of this Form?

2. It is calumnious, I had almost said blasphemous, to assert that they betray the Spirit to wandrings and aberrations; whereas on the other side, they guide and regulate it. Can we marshal our thoughts better, than by putting them in the order chalked out by our blessed Saviour.

3. It is false and abominable, to say, that the words by which we receive the Spirit of God divert and turn aside the spirit of man. For the Prayer is a portion of the Evangelick Doctrine *that bearing of Faith*, by which we receive the Holy Spirit, *Gal.* 3. 2.

4. Are these persons so replenished with good thoughts, that having bestowed whole hours in displaying their own Conceptions at their pleasure, they cannot spend two or three Minuts on the Lord's *Prayer*.

5. But if we must cashier the words of the Prayer, on pretence that they do not always jump right with the thoughts which may spring up in our mind in the act of Prayer, I would enquire at these Gentlemen, when any one of them

best

ſtirs his Gift in publick, is he ſure that all the
oughts of his Hearers will hit exactly to a Hair-
eadth with his thoughts, or with the expreſ-
s he ſtumbles upon? It would be a difficult
sk for him in a throng Meeting to find me out
he ſingle man ſo perfectly concurring and unit-
n with him; do not then his Auditors run the
me riſque to have their devout thoughts diver-
d by his expreſſions, or is it more diſturbing
hear a Prayer of our Saviours dictating, to
hich we have prepared and adjuſted our
oughts before hand, than to hear one of a mans
mpoſure, whoſe thoughts out-run and often
ſſle ours?

Object. 5. And this may ſuffice to boot for a
ply to the next Allegation made by them;
he Spirit (ſay they) ſhould be at liberty, and
t pent up within the narrow bounds of a ſor-
ulary.

Anſ. 1. And muſt the ſpirit of man, in order
its freedom, be licentious and irregular? or is
e ſaying the Lord's Prayer an intollerable ſlave-
? God of his mercy grant us always the liber-
of ſaying it.

2. This Prayer is apparently ſhort in words,
t in ſubſtance it is of ſo large extent as to com-
rehend Heaven and Earth, the preſent Age
d all future Generations. And are theſe men
ſuch a vaſt and unlimited ſpirit, that this can-
t do their turn?

3. Or if it be a captivity to hear the Lord's
ayer ſaid, is the ſpirit of the Hearers more en-
ralled by hearing our Saviors Prayer, than gi-
ng ear to the effuſion of a meer man?

Object. 6. The next Objection we are arm-
d with, is, The Lord's Prayer does not deſcend

to

o particulars; it expresses our need only in general terms; but they should, as occasion requires, be particularly and affectionately pressed and insisted upon.

Ans. 1. In all appearance, our Antagonists are afraid God does not hear them sufficiently, unless they point out with the Finger, and Decipher by Piecemeal, all their petty wants. And indeed, many instead of offering up Prayers to God, seem to give him Informations, and that under pretext of being particular. Severals also naming particulars, do but vent their Impertinency; and others by mistake, instead of an Egg pray for a Scorpion. I grant it is often necessary to be particular, but this requires great discretion, which is not every mans talent. General requests, such as these of the Lord's Prayer may be compared unto Stars, which have a fixed seat and regular motion. But when we offer at things in Hypothesi, we descend into the second Region of the Air, where all is turbulent and variable, and you shall meet with a continual justling of Reasons, like Waves tossed by contrary winds.

2. Besides if a man should undertake to mention all the mercies needful or expedient for him, he should never come to a close of praying. Can any person alive particularize all things requisite either to his being or well-being? all the kinds of temptations? all the depths of Satan? all his own Iniquities? *who can understand his errors?* (*Ps.* 19. 12.) and moreover, all the necessities of the Church universal, and of every Individual Member therein? how then should we conclude our Imperfect Prayers, and with what supplement to amend their lameness? undoubtedly we must

have

ve recourse to general terms, under which all rticulars are implicitely comprehended. As Instance, after having specified such and such s, and not being able to make a plenary enu- eration of all others, must we not say in gene- , *Forgive us our trespasses?* Wherefore I retort Argument, since it is impossible for us to mpile a Prayer including all particulars, we st necessarily make use of one, whose genera- y is comprehensive of all particulars imagi- ble.

Object. 7. But, say they, we no where read t the Apostles ever said this Prayer.

Ans. 1. This reason is not at all conclusive. A gative Argument is not to be drawn from Scri- re in a matter of fact, which abstracts from damentals of Faith. We do not find in the ed History, that the *Jews* observed the year Jubile, one of the most material points in the emonial Law; yet doubtless they did cele- te it, otherwise God would have infallibly llenged them for such a heinous neglect. We not read that the Apostles baptized in the me of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as y were commissionat to do, shall we thence er that they did not Baptize after this Form? . I should rather argue thus, Christ dictated Form of Prayer unto them; therefore they use it. Is it credible, that having desired a m of Prayer, and Christ having dictate them ; word for word, they never made use of it all this.

. And albeit they had not, the Apostles were ued with a Spirit which directed them in ying, as well as in Preaching. But dare we end to that infallible Spirit, which dictats such

nersuch Prayers to us as it did to them? Are
qu'sure, we do not trip, no more than they did,
ther as to Matter or Form?

Object. 8. In the next place, they ask us a Qu
stion. This *Prayer*, say they, is set down
two of the Evangelists (in the sixth of *M*
and 11 of *Luke*,) and that in different expr
sions; and which is more, the one of these H
Pen-men omits what the other has: How th
must we say it? whether as it is worded by
Matthew or St *Luke*. All this clearly demo
strats that our Saviour never intended we shou
adhere to the words of this *Prayer*.

Ans. 1. If this Argument took place, in
Celebration of the Lord's Supper, we ought
to use the words of Institution: For they
differently related in four different Books of
New Testament. So that one of the Evangel
in recording of them has omitted this imp
tant clause, *Do this in remembrance of me.* Sho
we then in this action totally reject our Savi
words, on pretence of this diversity, which
to be found in the Gospels. St. *Paul* did not
derstand it so. When he shews the *Corinthi*
after what manner they should celebrate
Lord's Supper, he tells them, *I received of*
Lord, that which I also delivered unto you,
then he repeats the down-right words spoke
our Saviour at the Institution of that Sacram
1 *Cor.* 11.

2. It is a bad Inference, that we should
take notice of the words, because of the vari
to be found in them. On the contrary, w
God repeats the same thing in different wo
we ought more carefully to observe them;
this diversity gives light to the meaning of

S

pture, for example, when one of the Evan-
ts says, *Forgive us our Debts*, the other ex-
ns it by saying, *Forgive us our sins*. We may
fferently lay hold of one or other of these
ases, both being equally dictated by Christ
s. Is the choice so difficult to make, or
t we cast away both, because Christ is the Au-
r of them both?

. As for that part of the Objection, that the
clusion or Doxologie (*For thine is the king-*
, &c.) is left out by one of the Evangelists,
answer is easie. Its just as if we should argue,
must not celebrate the Eucharist because one
he Evangelists (to wit St. *John*) speaks not
Syllable on't. If this Doxologie is not to be
nd in St. *Luke*, must it be hudled up in silence,
t it is set down in St. *Matthew*? or must
upon this account disuse this Prayer wholly,
ough it be recorded in both these Evange-
? There are several Psalms written on the
e Subject, as 14 and 53 are coincident: yet
re is some passage in the one which is not in
other; and must they both be sent a pack-
?

bject. 9. The next accusation against the use
he Lord's Prayer is, that a gross absurdity
onsequential thereupon. In it we pray for
daily bread. Now, say they, put the case a
be going to die, either gasping upon a bed
ckness, or upon a Scaffold, waiting the fatal
w, should we still petition for bread? To what
pose should he pray for a thing he no lon-
needs, and which can be no longer service-
to him?

ns. Several things may be replyed to this
ection: 1. If this Petition should only be put

up

up by such as are ascertain'd of life, it could ... ver be used at all: for these who are in the ... perfect health and vigour, do not know bet... next minut the night of death may over... them: So that this would infer, Christ ... taught us to ask that, which we ought neve... ask.

2. As there is none who can promise hi... the continuation of life for one day, so no ... can tell if that day shall be his last. How m... recover beyond all hope, when they are at ... gates of death? Albeit then a man were o... very brink of Eternity, since he knows not ... time of his departure, should he boldly reno... his *daily bread*, and the Divine bounty whi... the source of all his enjoyments, as if he we... sured it was no further needful.

3. When we pray for *bread*, it is always ... ditionally, in case we have further need ther... in case our days be prolonged in the land ... living: and not otherways. Nor is there ... impertinence in this request, or is it not rathe... duty to speak always thus?

4. It is well known, that this Petition ... restricted to food alone; for when I name ... I presuppose all that is necessary to life, a... Respiration, *&c.* And may I not ask these ... for the time I have to live, tho it were but ... single moment, in order to the glorifying of ...

5. Grant he who is at the point of death ... not any longer pray for his *daily bread*, fo... that, has he no more need to say, *Forgive m... sins, and lead us not into temptation?*

6. It is not Christs intention that any ... should pray for bread to himself alone; b... commands us to pray for it to others, saying

. If then a dying man cannot, or will not
k bread for himself, is he not obliged in cha-
ty to ask it for such as out-live him, and to
ay for posterity?

7. And lastly, Because expiring sick men, or
ing Malefactors, having no need of bread, must
thence conclude, that all others should ab-
in from praying for it? By the same reason
y should cease to eat and drink.

Object. 10. Many also scruple to say the Lord's
ayer, because it obliges them to say, they for-
ve them that sin against them. Now a man has
t always an intention to forgive. This is a
asable Pretext: For if I entertain vindictive
oughts, with what confidence can I say that I
rgive? Do I not make my self much more guil-
by so speaking? For why, this Clause contains
Imprecation I make against my self, *viz.* if I
not pardon, I desire not to be pardoned. Pur-
nt to this, many whose office leads them to
ay in publick, abstain from this Prayer, lest
y of their Hearers who joyn in Prayer with
em should be found liars to God.

Ans. 1. Much surely may be said on this tick-
h Question, whether or no a man who feels in
mself any risings of hatred and revenge should
spend the use of the Lord's Prayer on this
ad. I say, If he cannot say this Prayer, nei-
r can he make use of any other: So that to
bid a man the Lord's Prayer upon this ac-
nt, is to prohibite him the exercise of Pray-
in any form or manner whatsoever. The
lequence is easily demonstrable by many rea-
s. First, he cannot make a good Prayer, if
e not conform (at least in the substance)
the Lords Prayer. Now this Prayer obliges

him to say, that he forgives his enemies, so
If he do not say it in these express words, he
do it upon the matter. Besides, can he
up any Prayer without begging forgivene
his sins? And since that forgiveness is pro
him only on condition that he forgive ot
can he seek or expect it on another score?
if you forgive not men their trespasses, neither
your Father forgive your trespasses, Matt. 6.
Nay, he cannot ask any thing else of G
he be not ready to forgive. If he bring his
to the Altar, he must first be reconciled to
Brother, otherwise all his offerings and al
supplications are of no value. Add here
that no man can offer up a Prayer without
testing that he is willing to obey God: For
we beseech God to grant us our will, we pre
we will obey his. Now it is an Article o
will of God, that we forgive these who injur
I say then, if Rancour and Malice hinder a
from saying the Lord's Prayer, the same re
will justifie a total Cessation from Prayer.
what is the natural tendency of these mens
nion: For their Argument not only strikes a
Lords Prayer, but also at all these which
themselves are wont to conceive.

2. Now let us consider the pretended hi
rances: That man, say they, who instead of
giving, burns with revenge, whose soul is w
ly plunged in Gall, and filled with implac
wrath, can such a man say the Lord's Pra
To this I Answer, the Question in hand is
concerning those, who are entirely possessed
a Spirit of Revenge, and who have no desig
abate of their Malice: But the Debate is
cerning such as through infirmity find it un

orgive, and feel in themselves the flesh war-
against the Spirit. If then I be in these
cumstances, can I say, *Forgive me my sins*,
e I find difficulty to say, that I *forgive them*
sins against me. I answer again; among the
I crave pardon for, I reckon this is one,
difficulty to forgive. I beg pardon for this,
it is a difficult thing for me to grant pardon.
I pray for Grace, that may enable me to
lve. So that the meaning of this Clause there-
in this, Forgive me, as I pray thou would
nt me grace to be able to forgive. Can any
n stumble at this? Nay, is not every Christi-
obliged to speak so? And it is to no purpose
ledge, that there is a great difference betwixt
ng that we forgive, and saying, we desire
lly to forgive. For he who sincerely desires
lty to forgive, has already begun to forgive.
if this forgiveness proceed only from a heart
fectly appeased, shall we abstain from pray-
God till we arrive at perfection? Till we
e our Neighbour perfectly, that is, till we
e fulfilled the whole Law.

But after all has been said, suppose it abso-
ly unlawful to say this Prayer as long as a
n is for the least provoked with passion, is he
refore discharged to say it, when the smallest
k of anger is extinguished, and his heart is
nsed throughly from all hatred? If he be not
a condition to say it at one time, must he ab-
n from it forever? And moreover, must the
ole Body of the Church be interdicted the use
he Lord's Prayer, for the sake of a few re-
gnful tempers, that cannot use this Form,
the peevish passions of some be a standing
e to all? Finally, Is it well done of him who

prays

prays in publick, to accommodat himself re
to the malice of men, than to the prescripto
our blessed Saviour?

Object. 11. Further yet, they plead for t
excuse, that they comprehend the substanc
the Lord's Prayer in their usual Devotions,
they Paraphrase it, which is all one upon the
ter, albeit they have not the same expressio

Ans. 1. At this rate, they say not form
we forgive them that sin against us; but they
it upon the matter: Now is there any gre
inconvenience to say it in Christs very wo
than to say it in equivalent terms? and so f
through all the rest of the Lord's Prayer:
seing they acknowledge, we ought to ex
its whole meaning, may we not use the w
of it likewise?

2. On the contrary, when there is a de
about the commenting on a passage, it mu
repeated *verbatim*, that we may see if the
phrase quadrat with the Text. Since then
paraphrase the Lord's Prayer; why do
not repeat it, that we may discern if their
prase be agreeable to our Saviours words?

2. But again, are their Paraphrases of
same weight with our Saviours expressions
a Paraphrase on Scripture equally authen
with the Holy Scripture it self? The wor
the Lord's Prayer are Canonical, for they
portion of Sacred Writ. But these people
not aver, that their Prayers, or the wor
them are Canonical. For can a Prayer o
mine Composure serve for an infallible rule
Ministers Auditors? You'l find most exc
prayers in *Apocrypha*, both as to matter an
pression? Why then do we not put as great

on them, as we do upon those who are con-
ed in the Canonical Books? The reason is,
use tho they were framed and conceived by
of great piety and deep Judgment, yet they
not proceed from the Holy Ghost, in the same
lity, perfection, and authority, as these that
e pen'd by the Prophets, to which we dare not
ame to compare ours, far less to that of Christ's
ating. It is also weakly objected, *That at this
we should use no other Prayer but it.* For
t is just as one should say, it is not lawful to
ound the Scripture, because our Paraphrases
Interpretations are by no means so authentick
Scripture it self. We may paraphrase the
d's Prayer by other prayers, but we are no
s forbidden, under colour of our own para-
rases, to repeat it directly as it is set down.

Object. 12. I come now to their last Objecti-
, wherein they fancy they discover a vast deal
subtilty. The words of this prayer, say they,
re dictated for a patern of Prayer, but not to
used as a Prayer, they were intended for a
ectory, not for a set Form.

Ans 1. This is nothing else but meer quib-
g, and a silly evasion. Cannot these words be
th a *Prayer*, and a Model of Prayer? Cannot a
ilding serve for a Model to another Building?
these things inconsistent.

It is to be remarqued, Christ says not, Pr
ur Father, that his Name may be Hal
t he would give you your daily Bread Pray-
e notice how he speaks; say, *Our Father* ? to
in Heaven; say, *Hallowed be thy Name*, e-
ve us this day our daily Bread; say, *Forgi*
, say, *Deliver us*, &c. Is not this a down right
t-form of Prayer? Can any body put his own
words

I conclude then, it is our duty to say the L
Prayer. We ought to say it, because C
put it in our mouth. We ought to say it, bec
it is the marrow and abstract of all other Pray
We ought to say it, because it is the Rule
Pole-star to guide us in our Applications to C
We ought to say it, for redressing the imperf
ons of all our other Prayers. We ought to
it, because of its universality, as to all pur
persons, times, or places. It is a Prayer sa
all the Churches in the World: and it is no
comfort to me to bear my part in such a gen
Harmony. 'Tis a Prayer I can make use
Prosperity or Adversity, in Peace or War,
Sickness and Health, in Life and in Death.
Prayer that may be joyntly said by Young
Old, Rich and Poor, Prince and Peasant.

It is not an astonishing thing, that we are gr
jealous and suspicious of our Saviours words
our pious Fore-fathers, who under-went so g
sufferings to have the liberty of saying this p
er in a known Language, who took so much p
to teach it us, that we might have it always in
mouth: I say, if they could but look out of t
Graves, and see us labouring even to forget
prayer, how severly would they rebuke us,
what names would they call us? But which
yet more, behold, Christ Jesus himself expr
enjoyns you to say it. Whom will you ob
whether your Saviour, or these who labour
perswade you to the contrary? Fear not,
not to pronounce the words of Jesus Chr
Christ who dictated them will be your warr
at the Fathers hand, and will owne your wo
since they are likewise his own. Let them b
ways carried about in your Hearts, and upon y

L

ot. I conjure you, my Brethren, by the rea
ence you bear to our bleſſed Saviour, by the
eration you ſhould have for his words, by the
e he has teſtified towards us in teaching us this
yer, by the intereſt you have in praying a-
nt, and by the peace & comfort of the Church,
none ſnatch this precious Jewel from you,
ich the Son of God has given you out of his
n hands. And God grant that we may with
accord always preſent our Supplications to
Father which is in Heaven: For his is the King-
, Power, and Glory, for ever, and ever. Amen.

FINIS.